DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 201 209 FL 012 295

AUTHOR Laverty, Grace E.
TITLE Analysis of Bilingual/ESL Needs Questionnaire.
INSTITUTION Pennsylvania State Dept. of Education, Harrisburg. Bureau of Research and Evaluation.
PUB DATE Aug 80
NOTE 36p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Bilingual Education; Data Analysis; *Educational Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; *English (Second Language); Language Planning; *Needs Assessment; Parochial Schools; *Questionnaires; School Districts; Student Needs
IDENTIFIERS *Bilingual Programs; *Limited English Speaking; Pennsylvania

ABSTRACT

This is an analysis of a needs assessment questionnaire consisting of 17 questions on the needs and programs for limited English proficient (LEP) pupils in Pennsylvania, which was distributed to all public and parochial schools in the state. The analysis is based on 77% of the total forms sent. The returned forms were sorted into three groups: those with LEP enrollment, those with no LEP enrollment, and those with LEPs but no program. The statistics revealed that a substantial majority of Pennsylvania schools have no LEP pupils, and only about 17% of the total districts and schools have programs in bilingual education or English as a Second Language (ESL). The majority of schools with LEP pupils do provide a program to assist pupils in increasing their English language proficiency. The major needs expressed by the districts were for ESL and bilingual teachers, counselors, psychologists, social workers, administrators, and clerical staff. A need was expressed also for state leadership in supplying in-service workshops for all levels but especially for primary staff. A copy of the needs questionnaire is provided as an appendix. (AMH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED201209

ANALYSIS OF BILINGUAL/ESL NEEDS QUESTIONNAIRE

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Penn. State Dept. of Education
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

August 1980

Grace E. Laverty
Bureau of Research and Evaluation
Pennsylvania Department of Education

FL 012 295

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania
Dick Thornburgh, Governor

Department of Education
Robert G. Scanlon, Secretary

Bureau of Curriculum Services
David Campbell, Director

Communication, Family Living, Mathematics Division
Helen McLain, Chief

Office of Research, Planning and Data Management
Marna Whittington, Deputy Secretary

Division of Quantitative Analysis, Research
Development and Program Evaluation
Peggy Stank, Chief

Pennsylvania Department of Education
333 Market Street
P. O. Box 911
Harrisburg, PA 17108

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
List of Tables	iv
PROCEDURE	1
RESULTS	2
Schools Reporting LEP but No B/ESL Program	2
Schools Reporting B/ESL Programs	4
Questions 1 and 2: LEP Population	4
Question 3: LEP Pupil Needs	6
Question 4: Type of Program	7
Question 5: Bicultural Awareness	8
Question 6: Staff Census	8
Question 7: Cost	8
Question 8: Source of Funding	9
Question 9: Tests Used for Placement	9
Question 10: Evaluation of Achievement	12
Question 11 to 13: Vocational Education	12
Question 14: Problem Factors	12
Question 15: LEP Related School Needs	13
Question 16: State Leadership Needs	14
Question 17 and 18: Exceptional Pupils	14
Final Comment: Your Ideal Program	15
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	24
Summary	24
Conclusions	24
APPENDIX: Needs Questionnaire	26

LIST OF TABLES

		Page
Table 1	Sample of Needs Questionnaires Returned	1
Table 2	Language Represented in 184 Schools With No Bilingual/ESL Program	3
Table 3	Types of Treatment for LEP Pupils in Schools Without Bilingual/ESL Programs	4
Table 4	Number of LEP Pupils Reported in 190 Schools or Districts Reporting Programs	4
Table 5	Number of Public and Nonpublic Pupils Representing Each Non-English Home Language	5
Table 6	Description of LEP Pupils' Educational Needs	6
Table 7	Time Devoted to ESL Classes	7
Table 8	Hours Per Week for ESL Tutoring and Resource Room Activity	7
Table 9	Sources of Funds for Bilingual/ESL Programs	9
Table 10	Tests Used for Pupil Placement	10
Table 11	Problem Factors in B/ESL Programs	12
Table 12	Major Needs of Districts with B/ESL Programs	13
Table 13	Needs for State Leadership to Educate LEP Students	14

Analysis of Bilingual/ESL Needs Questionnaire

PROCEDURE

At the request of the Communication, Family Living, Mathematics Division of the Bureau of Curriculum Services, a questionnaire was prepared to ascertain the current needs for bilingual/English as a second language (B/ESL) programs in Pennsylvania. The initial drafts were revised in cooperation with the Pennsylvania Department of Education (PDE) Second Language Advisors, in preparation for a review by several directors of bilingual/ESL programs in the schools. After review and revision, a final form of the needs questionnaire was prepared for distribution (see Appendix).

The Needs Questionnaire was sent to 504 public school districts and 923 nonpublic parochial schools in late March. Because of the busy time of year for school administrators, forms were received and processed well into June before data analysis began. The final count of respondents was 430 public school districts (85%) and 661 nonpublic schools (72%) for an overall total of 1,091 returned forms, or 77 percent of total forms sent.

The returned forms were sorted into three groups: (1) schools with Limited English Proficient (LEP) pupils who operated some type of educational program specifically for these pupils, (2) schools who have no LEP pupils and (3) schools who reported that indeed, they have pupils with home languages other than English, but they either have too few LEPs to run a bilingual program or these pupils speak English well and are not really LEP pupils. Table 1 below shows the distribution of these three types of responses.

Table 1

Sample of Needs Questionnaires Returned

	Number of Forms Sent	Forms Showing LEP Enrollment	Forms Showing No LEP Enrollment	Forms With LEPs But No Program	Total Returns
Public	504	149	255	26	430
Nonpublic	923	41	462	158	661
TOTAL	1,427	190	717	184	1,091
Percent of Returns		17	66	17	

No analysis could be done of the 717 responses showing no LEP enrollment. Separate analyses were accomplished for the two groups reporting LEP enrollment. The 190 forms giving more or less complete program information were analyzed with the help of computer programs. The 184 reporting LEP pupils or pupils with home languages other than English but no special program were analyzed manually because of their limited scope of information. It can be seen from Table 1 that, if the sample of returned forms is representative of the state population, a substantial majority of Pennsylvania schools have no LEP pupils. Only about 17 percent of the total districts and schools report programs.

RESULTS

Schools Reporting Other Languages But No Bilingual/ESL Program

There seem to be two major reasons why schools with children whose home language is not English do not have bilingual or English as a Second Language (ESL) programs. In many schools the number of LEP students is so small and/or pupils are so transient that a program cannot be arranged. In many other cases the pupils hear or speak another language at home, but also speak English. These children are English speaking and need no special program. Table 2 shows the number of children in these schools reported as speaking or having parents who speak a language other than English.

The largest single group shown in Table 2 is 528 children of Italian parents attending Roman Catholic schools. In most of the schools reporting substa ntial numbers in this category, the respondents noted that the pupils know English and do well in school. This is also true of the schools reporting Croatian, Chinese, Polish and Ukranian home languages as well as substantial numbers of other language groups. The various ways of handling these groups are shown in Table 3. It can be seen that the single answer given by the largest number of respondents is the first one, that students speak English, which is not a treatment, but rather an explanation. Some schools gave multiple responses, indicating that pupils are treated according to their individual needs.

Table 3

Types of Treatment for LEP Pupils in Schools Without Bilingual/ESL Programs
(Public, N=26; Nonpublic, N=157)

Treatment	Public	Nonpublic
Another language is spoken in home, but pupils speak English well (no treatment)	5	54
Work with them in regular classes	7	35
Peer tutoring	3	12
IU Speech therapist	1	8
IU Remedial reading teacher (Title I or other)	2	11
IU Itinerant ESL teacher	5	18
Resource room; Resource teacher	3	7
Parent volunteer (aide/tutor)	1	3
ESL tutoring outside school	1	2
Upward Bound tutor (ESSC and Wilkes)	0	2
Sent to public school for ESL	0	1
Exchange students	2	2
No bilingual program	2	18
B/ESL requested from IU but not yet arranged	1	3
No comment (probably no program)	3	16
Special case - foreign students here especially for ESL	-	1

Table 2

Languages Represented in 184 Schools With No Bilingual/ESL Program

Language	Number of Pupils: Public Districts	Nonpublic Schools	Total
Arabic	9	11	20
Armenian	1	0	1
Cambodian	1	2	3
Chinese	5	34	39
Croatian	2	16	18
Czech	0	11	11
Dutch	2	0	2
Flemish	0	2	2
French	0	15	15
German	3	15	18
Greek	5	26	31
Hebrew	1	0	1
Hindi	5	28	33
Hungarian	0	8	8
Italian	5	528	533
Jamaican	1	1	2
Japanese	0	7	7
Korean	24	41	65
Lithuanian	0	1	1
Laotian	1	8	9
Malaysian	1	3	4
Norwegian	0	2	2
Pakistani	0	1	1
Pennsylvania German	0	2	2
Persian (Farsi)	4	1	5
Polish	3	13	16
Portuguese	2	22	24
Rumanian	0	1	1
Russian	0	2	2
Slovak	0	10	10
Spanish	10	287	297
Swedish	1	4	5
Tagalog	2	23	25
Thai	2	6	8
Ukranian	0	28	28
Vietnamese	25	126	151
Unknown	0	2	2
Other	1 (Tegalic)	*8	9
TOTAL	116	1,295	1,411

*3 Haitian
1 Ibo
3 Telugu
1 Nigerian

Schools Reporting Bilingual/ESL Programs

Responses to the first question show that in the 190 schools who completed the entire questionnaire there were 12,482 pupils whose first language is other than English or who came from homes where a language other than English is spoken. The number in a particular school or district ranged from 1 to 2,421 for public school districts and from 1 to 439 for nonpublic schools. Table 4 shows the distribution of LEP pupils by grade levels.

Table 4

Number of LEP Pupils Reported in 190 Schools or Districts Reporting Programs

Grades	K-3	4-6	7-9	10-12	ALL
Public	3,481	2,483	2,054	1,600	9,618
Nonpublic	1,196	701	582	385	2,864
TOTAL	4,677	3,184	2,636	1,985	12,482

The largest single non-English language group is Spanish with well over 8,000 pupils. The second largest group is Vietnamese with over 1,000. Table 5 shows the languages represented and the number of pupils for each language. The languages alphabetically listed from Arabic to Vietnamese appeared on the compliance sheet used previously by the PDE program staff. The "other languages" were listed by schools as they filled out their forms. Comparison of Table 5 with Table 2 shows somewhat similar proportions of the most frequently represented languages except for the large representation of Italian as a home language in schools represented in Table 2. As most of these were actually not LEP pupils but only came from homes where Italian was also spoken, and as most of them were also in nonpublic schools, this number may reflect a greater knowledge of ethnic background in the small private schools.

Question 3 asked respondents to describe the apparent educational needs of their LEP pupils. Some responded for all who were counted on questions 1 and 2; others did not count the groups which were proficient in English, truly bilingual, or got along very well in school in spite of a non-English home language. Table 6 shows the responses to this question.

Table 5

Number of Public and Nonpublic Pupils Representing Each Non-English Home Language

Language	Public	Nonpublic	TOTAL
Arabic	320	10	330
Armenian	9	0	9
Burmese	4	1	5
Cambodian	47	0	47
Chinese	206	222	428
Czech	3	0	3
Dutch	17	0	17
Efik	6	0	6
Farsi	52	3	55
Flemish	2	0	2
French	44	7	51
German	63	5	68
Greek	191	7	198
Gajaratic	24	0	24
Hebrew	24	0	24
Hindi	117	15	132
Hungarian	3	0	3
Italian	137	104	241
Jamaican English	36	0	36
Japanese	94	1	95
Korean	378	40	418
Laotian	123	1	124
Malaysian	27	75	102
Norwegian	1	0	1
Pakistani	10	4	14
Pennsylvania German	37	0	37
Polish	10	18	28
Portuguese	49	93	141
Rumanian	2	1	3
Russian	23	0	23
Serbian	8	0	8
Slovak	3	0	3
Spanish	6,263	2,023	8,286
Swahili	4	0	4
Swedish	14	0	14
Tagalog	23	74	97
Thai	43	2	45
Turkish	4	0	4
Ukranian	5	84	89
Urdu	1	0	1
Vietnamese	935	87	1,022
Unknown	8	0	8
Other "languages" reported:	(50)	(9)	(59)
Albanian	2	0	2
Bangladesh	8	0	8
Bengali	1	0	1
Creole	0	1	1
Danish	5	0	5
Egyptian	1	0	1
Ethiopian	3	3	6
Finnish	3	0	3
Formosan	1	0	1
Greenlandish	1	0	1
Iceland	3	0	3
Indonesian	2	0	2
Nigerian	3	0	3
South African	1	0	1
Tanzanian	2	0	2
Telugu	0	4	4
Ugandan	1	0	1
West African	3	0	3
Yugoslavian	6	1	7
Zaire	4	0	4

Table 6

Description of LEP Pupils' Educational Needs

Description	Public		Nonpublic	
	Number Responding	Number of Pupils	Number Responding	Number of Pupils
Do not speak or understand English	91	1,374	17	178
Little educational background in home language	64	1,465	21	1,293
Speak, but have difficulty reading and writing English	108	2,947	34	1,222
Other:				
Proficient in English; get along well	29	696	5	108
Bilingual students	1	16	-	-
May have difficulty with technical vocabulary, implied meanings, classwork	7	56	2	4
Read and write, but oral communication difficult	3	11	-	-
Limited skills, need continued help in all language areas	25	164	2	9
Foreign exchange students	2	6	-	-
Entered with very limited English proficiency	1	6	-	-
Understand but refuse to use English	1	19	-	-
Need American culture and social development	2	100	-	-
Need motor skills development	1	50	-	-

Question 4 examined the type of program offered to meet these needs. Only 15 respondents said they have bilingual programs; another 15 have students in regular classes with bilingual aides. Apparently the larger number of schools use ESL classes or ESL tutoring to meet the language needs. Of these, the large majority had ESL classes one to three hours per day, five days per week, as shown in Table 7.

Table 7

Time Devoted to ESL Classes

	Days per week					Hours per day						
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Public	0	5	2	2	40	25	8	6	-	2	1	1
Nonpublic	2	2	0	0	9	7	1	1	-	3	1	0
TOTAL	2	7	2	2	49	32	9	7	-	5	2	1

It was impossible to interpret accurately the various numbers given for the remainder of the items in Question 4. In some cases the number of hours per week was apparently the number per pupil, in others, hours per week must have been the total for all pupils. Another problem was duplication in hours for resource room and resource teacher, ESL tutoring and itinerant IU teacher or peer tutor. Table 8 shows the responses received. Some evident duplication has been edited out, but some which could not be identified accurately was allowed to remain.

Table 8

Hours Per Week for ESL Tutoring and Resource Room Activity

	Number of Hours Per Week													
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11-15	16-20	>20	Range
ESL Tutoring														
#Public	3	11	15	5	17	2	1	3	-	6	4	1	5	1-75
#Nonpublic	2	2	0	1	3	3	0	3	-	0	2	1	0	1-20
#TOTAL	5	13	15	6	20	5	1	6	-	6	6	2	5	
Resource Room														
#Public	3	2	4	2	4	1	-	-	-	5	3	-	1	1-32
#Nonpublic	0	0	0	0	1	0	-	-	-	0	2	-	0	5-15
#TOTAL	3	2	4	2	5	1	-	-	-	5	5	-	1	
Resource Teacher														
#Public	2	5	8	2	7	0	-	-	1	4	2	2	4	1-68
#Nonpublic	0	2	2	1	2	1	-	-	0	0	2	0	1	2-25
#TOTAL	2	7	10	3	9	1	-	-	1	4	4	2	5	
Peer Tutoring														
#Public	3	4	5	3	10	1	-	0	-	4	1	1	-	1-16
#Nonpublic	1	2	0	1	1	1	-	1	-	0	0	0	-	1-8
#TOTAL	4	6	5	4	11	2	-	1	-	4	1	1	-	
Itinerant IU Teacher														
#Public	4	4	2	3	5	1	1	-	-	2	2	-	4	1-37
#Nonpublic	3	2	2	0	3	2	0	-	-	0	1	-	0	1-12
#TOTAL	7	6	4	3	8	3	1	-	-	2	3	-	4	

A number of respondents explained different teaching arrangements under the "Other" category. Among the 60 responses and explanations, the following appeared most frequently:

16 Used help from reading specialist, remedial reading, Title I, etc.
9 Depended on individual attention in class by teachers, aides or peers
8 Parent, community or college volunteers to tutor as needed
7 Tutoring supplied by school district personnel

The majority (about 110) of respondents either omitted Question 5, indicated no bicultural segment of the program is needed, or stated that they help the pupils to learn English. The single method of providing the bicultural awareness mentioned most frequently was delegation to the social studies curriculum through special projects, world cultures classes, bicultural mini courses, ethnic awareness class or other social studies related classes. The various methods used are listed below:

33 Part of social studies curriculum
14 Bilingual/ESL teacher includes units or material on native heritage and American culture
13 Discussions in the regular classroom as part of other subjects
13 Exchange ideas on native music, food, dress, art
13 Celebrate holidays, PanAmerican Week, PR social functions
12 Assemblies during year and district cultural awareness day
10 Exhibits, displays, books, material and supplies provided
7 Parental involvement, send letters, messages, bulletins in home language
6 Staff in-service for teacher awareness
6 Literature class and reading projects
6 Schoolwide program cultural appreciation, "heritage approach"
4 Intercultural field trips
3 Puerto Rican units in elementary school
1 Use of ethnic foods in lunch program

Question 6 presented some problems of analysis because of apparent misinterpretation. Schools with no indication of a bilingual program showed numbers of bilingual program teachers. On some questionnaires an ESL program was indicated in Question 4, and no ESL program teachers were claimed. In these cases the teachers were credited to the ESL program. In cases where no bilingual program was shown, it was assumed that although the teachers may have indeed been bilingual or multilingual, they could not be considered teachers in a bilingual program that did not exist. The preanalysis editing removed these.

The resulting numbers were: 58 bilingual program teachers in 17 schools or districts, 204 ESL program teachers in 103 districts or schools, and 107 instructional aides in 46 schools or districts.

Question 7 asked how much the program for LEP pupils cost per pupil in addition to the regular per pupil instructional cost. The per pupil costs ranged from 0 to $3,000 for public school districts and from 0 to $500 for nonpublic schools. The average (mean) cost overall was $302 per LEP pupil served; the public mean was $382 and the nonpublic mean was $13. This may appear to be a large discrepancy between cost for public and nonpublic, but an examination of the results for Question 8 shows that the majority of public schools used local funds while most of the nonpublic schools depended on the IU or federal funds for the service.

How is the bilingual/ESL program funded? Table 9 shows some of the sources of funds.

Table 9

Sources of Funds for Bilingual/ESL Programs

	Public	Nonpublic	TOTAL
Local funds	101	2	103
ESEA Title VII	3	3	6
ESEA Title I	18	15	33
IndoChinese Refugee Children Assistance Act	18	1	19
Migrant Education	7	3	10
Other sources were:			
Combination of local funds and one of above	13		13
Intermediate Unit	4	5	9
Act 89 or 95		4	4
Impact Aid	1		1
ESEA Title IV	2		2
Tuition charges		3	3

Question 9 concerned tests used for initial placement in schools and/or entry into the regular program after leaving a bilingual program. Question 17B asked for a listing of tests used to diagnose learning handicaps. Since the same testing process could be used for any or all of these purposes, the two questions will be discussed in this section.

Most of the schools with only a small number of LEP pupils do not use tests for placement. In many of these schools the IU consultant on ESL does the placement by tests or interviews, and the school respondent does not know how it is done or can't name the tests used.

Some districts, where tests are used for placement, mentioned using psychological or achievement tests but did not specify which ones. Others use district-made tests or scales devised by the ESL specialist.

Among the tests identified, a few were named a number of times. Many were reported with a variety of titles which makes it difficult to present a list which could be used by other districts. However, the tests in Table 10 were mentioned as being used for initial placement (P), move to regular class (M) or special class assignment (SE).

Table 10

Tests Used for Pupil Placement

	Name of Instrument	Number of Mentions *P	M	SE
A.	Instruments listed in Tests in Print II, Oscar Buros, Ed., 1974			
CELT	A Comprehensive English Language Test for Speakers of English as a Second Language (ESL)	2	1	
	Diagnostic Test for Students of ESL (Davis)	3	2	
	Michigan Test of Aural Comprehension	2	1	
	Oral Rating Form for Rating Language Proficiency in Speaking and Understanding English (Harris)	5	1	
WRAT	Wide Range Achievement Tests	3	2	8
CAT	California Achievement Tests		1	
MAT	Metropolitan Achievement Tests	2	1	1
SRA	SRA Achievement Series	1		
SAT	Stanford Achievement Test	2		
STS	STS Educational Development Series: Scholastic Tests	3	2	
CTBS	Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills		3	
	Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests	4	1	
SDRT	Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test	1		
WRMT	Woodcock Reading Mastery Tests	2	2	
BRI	Botel Reading Inventory	7		
	Durrell Listening-Reading Series	1		
	Gilmore Oral Reading Test		1	
SORT	Slosson Oral Reading Test	1		
TOEFL	Test of English as a Foreign Language	1		
	Tests for Auditory Comprehension of Language (Carrow)	10	5	
	Basic Sight Word Test (Dolch)	1		
	Classroom Reading Inventory (Silvaroli)	2		
MRT	Metropolitan Readiness Tests	2	1	
	Northwestern Syntax Screening Test	1		
	Key Math Diagnostic Arithmetic Test	2	1	3
	Stanford Diagnostic Arithmetic Test	2		
ITPA	Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities			1
PPVT	Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test	5		3
	McCarthy Scales of Children's Abilities			1
	Arthur Point Scale of Performance Tests			1
	Hiskey-Nebraska Test of Learning Aptitude			1
	Leiter International Performance Scale			5
	Culture Fair Intelligence Test			1
	Valett Developmental Survey of Basic Learning Abilities	1		
	Raven Non-Language Test (Progressive Matrices)	1		
	Pictorial Test of Intelligence (French)			1
VMI	Developmental Test of Visual-Motor Integration			1
	Bender-Gestalt Tests (Several titles)	1		4
SIT	Slosson Intelligence Test	1	1	2
S-B	Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scale			8
WISC	Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children (also WPPSI)			
EIWN	and Spanish version	2	3	18
	Columbia Mental Maturity Scale	1		
DAT	Differential Aptitude Tests (Language Usage)	1		

Table 10 (cont'd)

	Name of Instrument	Number of Mentions P	M	SE
A.	cont'd			
PASS	Primary Academic Sentiment Scale			1
	Human Figure Drawing Techniques	1		3
	Vineland Social Maturity Scale			1
TAT	Thematic Apperception Test			1
	Rorschach			1
B.	Instruments not in 1974 Buros			
	Thumbnail Diagnostic Placement Test (Virginia Allen)	7	2	
	Informal Oral Proficiency Test	3		
BOLT	Balvia Oral Language Test	1	1	
	Lembo Survival English Oral Test	1	1	
	Moreno Oral English Proficiency	2	1	
	Language Screening Test (Oral and Written), 1975 revision	1		
	I Speak English	1		
	Language Proficiency Interview		1	
	English Proficiency Test	1	1	
	Standard Language Dominance Test		1	
	James Language Dominance Test	6	2	1
	Language Assessment Inventory	1		
LAB	Language Assessment Battery	7	3	
LAS	Language Assessment Scales	7		
	Moreno Quick Language Assessment Inventory	1	1	
	Inventory of Readiness Skills (Spanish-English)	1		
	SHUT Primary Language Test	1		
	Aural Reading Comprehension		4	
	Informal Reading Inventory	3	4	
	Skozylas Phonemic	3		
	CLOZE Procedures	2	4	
	The Emergency Reading Teachers' Manual	1		
	Brigance Developmental, Placement and Proficiency Test Package	1		
	Brigand Basic Skills	2		
	Amidon Diagnostic Program	1		
	Amidon Developmental, Step III	1		
	Publishers Placement Tests (Scott Foresman, Holt, Houghton-Mifflin)	2	2	
	CORA			1
	SLEP	1		
	Digit Span			1

*P=initial placement, M=move to regular class, SE=placement in special class.

It is indeed possible that some of the tests named in the "B" section of this table are actually incompletely named duplicates of those found in the A section, but there was no way to be sure. The absence of the "B" section titles from the Buros 1974 Tests in Print II does not reflect their quality but only their age. This volume has a few ESL tests listed, many of them for college entrance, but no tests for language dominance. The need for and use of diagnostic and placement tests for pupils with non-English languages is evidently a recent development.

This list reveals that overall, for the three types of testing, the most frequently used assessment instruments or batteries are the WRAT, Wechsler Series (WISC-R, EIWN), LAB and LAS, James Language Dominance, Allen's Thumbnail Diagnostic Placement, S-B, PPVT, Carrow's Tests for Auditory Comprehension of Language, and the Botel Reading Inventory. Some of these can be given only by a properly certified school psychologist (e.g., S-B and Wechsler), but others are available to counselors and trained teachers.

Question 10 is closely related to 9 and 17; it asks how achievement of pupils in bilingual and ESL program is evaluated. It appears that schools use these methods:

Public	Nonpublic	TOTAL	
57	17	74	take standardized achievement tests in English
94	27	121	take teacher-made tests in English
8	0	8	take standardized achievement tests in their native language
7	3	10	take teacher-made tests in their native language
31	9	40	are not tested at all because of language problems
42	11	5	others, mostly combinations of the above

Supplying LEP pupils with vocational training has been seen as a problem in the past. According to the present questionnaire, only 14 respondents, 13 public and 1 nonpublic, have a bilingual/ESL component in their vocational education program. In grades 10 to 12, however, 191 LEP students were enrolled in vocational education programs and 279 were in vocational-technical schools.

Question 14 is also a reference to factors which have appeared in the past as problems in providing programs for LEP pupils. Respondents were asked to check whether these problems adversely affected their program "not at all," "some" or "a lot." Responses to this item are shown in Table 11.

Table 11

Problem Factors in B/ESL Programs

Factor	Not at All	Some	A Lot	No Response
Pupil mobility	85	50	28	27
Attendance irregularity	119	35	10	26
Lack of materials in child's language	77	60	27	26
Lack of personnel proficient in child's language	62	73	34	21
Too great an age difference in a class	120	38	5	27

Question 15 attempted to find out the major needs of each school or district. Respondents were asked to indicate the "major need area," but many gave multiple responses, so these responses were all processed. A total of 114 indicated needs in the area of staff, 67 checked materials, 68 denoted opportunities for in-service and 22 had other responses. The major response given as "other" need was that the program is adequate at present and they do not need anything additional. Table 12 shows more complete detail on needs specified by the districts with bilingual/ESL programs.

Table 12

Major Needs of Districts with B/ESL Programs

Needs	Public	Nonpublic	TOTAL
A. Staff	84	30	114
Elementary bilingual teachers	17	14	31
Secondary bilingual teachers	14	3	17
ESL teachers	43	14	57
Bilingual aides	21	8	29
Bilingual psychologist	14	6	20
Bilingual counselors	16	8	24
Bilingual clerical staff	5	2	7
Bilingual administrators	5	3	8
Bilingual social worker	9	9	18
Other: Mostly "IU staff meets our needs"	29	3	32
B. Materials	53	13	66
Textbooks in native language, dialects (esp. S.E. Asians)	10	1	11
Language Masters, other audiovisual material and equipment	5	4	9
ESL materials incorporating content areas	13	1	14
High interest, low reading level, reading materials	6	1	7
Bilingual primary materials, colorful, interesting	4	0	4
Self-directing reference material, native dictionaries	5	2	7
Diagnostic and other tests	3	2	5
A variety of single requests	7	2	9
C. In-Service Opportunities			
Intercultural programs, awareness of differences and problems for all	16	2	18
Techniques for regular classroom teachers to coordinate with ESL and adapt for LEPs, also for aides	24	3	27
Techniques and methods to teach ESL, for teachers	11	3	14
Information on ESL program, for total staff	4	0	4
Methods and material development and selection, teachers and aides	2	2	4
English and parenting courses for parents	3	1	4
Workshop on mainstreaming, tutoring, evaluation, diagnosis and placement, to share experience	5	1	6

Question 16 requested information for the PDE concerning leadership needs from the schools. As in other questions, respondents were unable to select the single most important response. Many commented that leadership was needed at all grade levels and in several of the topical areas. Table 13 shows a tabulation of all responses received for each part of the question. It can be seen that primary level was important to the majority of respondents and in-service workshops on methods was the topic selected most frequently.

Table 13

Needs for State Leadership to Educate LEP Students

	Public	Nonpublic	TOTAL
A. School grade level			
Preschool	15	6	21
Primary	70	20	90
Middle School	34	3	37
High School	27	3	30
B. Topical area			
In-service workshops on methods	69	11	80
Technical assistance on proposal guidelines	13	1	14
Encouragement of teacher education programs	19	11	30
In-service on understanding diverse cultures	26	10	36
Publications	6	0	6

Questions 17 and 18 concern treatment of the exceptional LEP student, either handicapped or gifted. Respondents identified a total of 288 pupils in need of special education in 30 public school districts and 7 nonpublic schools. However, only five respondents say they have bilingual special education classes and only 13 of the psychologists who tested these students speak the students' native languages.

In 18 public districts and 3 nonpublic schools, 168 LEP students are enrolled in classes for the gifted. In 86 public districts and 5 nonpublic schools, however, the LEP pupils are tested for entrance into the gifted program.

The tests used to test students for special education placement are shown in Table 10. The ones used most frequently for this purpose are the Wechsler and Stanford-Binet intelligence scales, the Wide Range Achievement Tests and the Leiter International Performance Scale.

Final Comment: Your Ideal Program

The Needs Questionnaire form contained a final unnumbered item which asked: "If you could have the ideal situation, what method do you think would be best for educating LEP pupils? What staff and facilities would you want?" About one hundred people took time to respond to this item with definite suggestions. Others said the present situation is fine, or they are too new with the LEP problem to know.

The suggestions given were necessarily based on the experiences of each respondent. The most frequently mentioned types of method or arrangement were appropriate for those situations with only a few LEP pupils. These included:

9 Provision through local IU to meet LEP need.
2 IU ESL teacher should devise placement and promotion measures.
2 Consolidation with neighboring districts to provide full-time person and share materials.
2 Use school district adults as tutors.
1 Send child to district where bilingual/ESL programs are operational.
2 Peer tutor several hours per week (after school hours).
1 Get volunteer tutors from nearby colleges.
13 Itinerant teacher as tutor and as resource person for the regular classroom teacher.

Some comments concerned the appropriate methods to be used, based on educational theory rather than size of group. These comments may be based on experience with more LEP children, involving either larger groups at a time or small numbers over an extended period of time. These suggestions included:

11 ESL to provide English proficiency is the best method.
2 Fluency and literacy in the students' own language is necessary as a preparation for learning English. Maintenance in early grades, then ESL.
6 Strong ESL immersion program in regular classroom with individualized instruction for new students.
33 Regular class with supportive services:

4-Native language teacher's aide
7-Close supervision and individual tutorial attention
15-Resource room/teacher to support student and supply tutorial service
1-Full-time ESL for several weeks for new entrants then regular class with ESL
6-LEP pupils spent 2-3 hours per day in ESL classroom which has language lab. facilities, materials, learning centers to learn English and American culture. (LEP pupils may be bussed from entire district.)

2 Regular class, regular program. Let pupil spend a year picking up the language.
6 Small classes or one-to-one pupil/teacher ratio. One teacher and one aide per language; materials and library available.
4 Need more ESL teachers and aides.
2 More coordination of the ESL program with other services and personnel.
5 State supply the money for district ESL teachers.
1 Total ESL until child can function in regular classroom.

In contrast to these statements that ESL is the ideal treatment, a few argued for a bilingual program.

3 Self-contained class until language is mastered. (Assume a bilingual teacher.)
2 Transitional bilingual approach for K and Pre-K. (One says make Pre-K and K mandatory.)
4 Maintenance bilingual/bicultural program would be ideal. Bilingual program pupils would be in a self-contained classroom. After mainstreaming, pupils would have a minimum of two hours per week of native language instruction.

A few of the other suggestions were of interest, discussing other useful features:

4 Home visits to enlist the support and encouragement of parents by a community aide.
2 Get communication skills to parents and students as quickly as possible by ESL.
1 Have a pilot school to work on methods and curricula and disseminate the best information to schools.

From a number of respondents came the suggestion, plea, statement that the state and the IUs should provide teachers, methods, in-service training or, even more, funds to enable schools to meet the needs of LEP pupils.

One discouraged staff member commented that the ideal is impossible. It would take a 48 hour day with total immersion in English for long periods, time to learn subject matter in the most appropriate language, and a 1:1 teacher-pupil ratio. Another respondent commented:

> Our group of four could not agree. Some desire a full-time language center ("language immersion"), some favor a resource room, intercultural, partial mainstreamed approach. The answer to this issue would indicate any facilities and materials needed.

This statement seems to reflect the state of the art in a much wider arena. The underlying basic philosophy of education for LEP pupils shows no unity from place to place or from time to time.

The following program descriptions give in slightly greater detail the elements of several varying ideas for ideal programs.

A. Maintenance bilingual/bicultural program would be ideal. Bilingual program pupils would be in a self-contained classroom. After mainstreaming, pupils would have a minimum of two hours per week of native language instruction. Staff should include bilingual/bicultural psychologists, counselors and special education teachers at all levels. In secondary school bilingual/bicultural teachers would be part of regular teaching staff in all content areas. English dominant students should participate. Program should be supported by state funds.

B. Bilingual psychologist to test children upon entrance into preschool program to determine:

a. dominance of native language, oral, written, composition
b. proficiency in English language, oral, written
c. readiness to enter school
d. IQ in English, Spanish (native intelligence)

If student tests low IQ in native language, further testing is required. Entrance into bilingual class follows special education.

If ready for school, should be placed in bilingual kindergarten where concepts are introduced and explained in native language as much as possible.

First grade: Bilingual teacher for Reading Language Arts, Math, Spelling; 85% instruction in Spanish--ESOL Services, 1 hour a day

Second grade: Bilingual teacher for all major subject areas mentioned above--Spanish instruction 75%, ESOL 1 hour

Third grade: Instruction 60% in Spanish by bilingual teacher in subject areas, ESOL 1 hour

Fourth grade: Transitional--English greatly increased to total English environment.

5th-8th grade: Total English with bilingual teacher as resource.

C. 1. Bilingual or multilingual teachers, especially those with clear understanding of social/cultural interaction
2. Bilingual or ESL teacher aides to work closely with ESL teachers
3. Teachers certified in both English and foreign language teaching methods, and who are capable and flexible enough to adapt approaches and class activities to the needs of individual students
4. Non-English speaking students should be referred to the Bilingual/ESL program as soon as they are enrolled in school. Such students should be immediately and systematically guided and assisted through their process of acculturation by qualified teachers.
5. Modified schedules which would allow for more emphasis on the target language, at least in the initial stage and then gradual absorption of students into the mainstream of schoolwork and activities. This should ensure for ESL students a better chance to perform at their maximum capacity in their schoolwork, to develop self-confidence and to achieve success.
6. A well-equipped language lab and up-to-date audiovisual aids

D. Middle School and Elementary Levels:

1. Self-contained classroom, except for a few classes.
2. Materials appropriate to all content areas - science, social studies, health and reading. They seem to lack general background knowledge common to American pupils. If they are to enter regular classes and succeed they must be given this data.
3. Reading texts appropriate to ESL pupils should be used. Students literate in their native tongue should have reading materials in that language as well.
4. If there is a wide range of age/abilities the teacher needs an aide - possibly other students.

High School Students:

1. Initial stress on vocabulary and conversation.
2. ESL teachers should spend at least two hours with students every school day.
3. Bilingual materials for use as student reference material.
4. If individualized study is implemented I would seek the assistance of at least one teaching aide.
5. High interest reading materials for all levels.
6. Language master and tape recorders and tapes.

E. A resource room set up for our elementary pupils would be ideal. Since our students come from a variety of backgrounds, a bilingual teacher is not feasible, but a Vietnamese-English bilingual aide might be helpful. The resource room teacher should be a regular classroom teacher with some experience in second language learning. All LEP pupils would report to the resource room for ESL class with the ESL teacher and reading instruction from the resource room teacher. Any LEP student unable to function in a math group at his grade level would also receive math instruction in the resource room at his instructional level. If time would permit, the resource room teacher could also introduce some science and social studies vocabulary and concepts to the more advanced students.

At the second level, LEP students who can function in some regular classes should still have English class with the ESL teacher. In addition, each should have a study period a day with either a bilingual aide or at least, an aide with a fairly wide educational background who would be able to answer their questions about their various subjects. One of the secondary schools should be designated as the center for all secondary nonfunctional students, i.e., those students who speak and understand such a limited amount of English that they cannot function in regular classes. With the exception of some minor subjects and perhaps math which they could attend with the rest of the student body, these students should be assigned to a concentrated program of English with the ESL teacher, or an instructional aide when the ESL teacher is unavailable. These students should spend at least one hour each day under the direct supervision of the ESL teacher.

F. For our purposes and language mixture ESL is the only viable solution for educating LEP pupils. Emphasis should be placed initially on communication survival skills followed by a four skills approach.

In an ideal situation we would want adequate numbers of teachers with ESL or language teaching backgrounds. With enough teachers class size could be small enough to allow for proper grouping of students by proficiency in English as well as age. We would like to see students given adequate time with teachers to meet the students needs.

In addition, it would be beneficial to have a community liaison person fluent in the home language and in English. This would facilitate home and school communication.

Ideally the ESL teachers would have their own classrooms with audio-visual equipment readily available. Such items as tape recorders, listening stations and overhead projectors might be included in the classrooms' equipment.

In the upper grades we would like to see an established sequence in the language arts curriculum once students have achieved an advanced level of proficiency in the English language.

G. 1. Despite low number of LEP pupils and various languages represented, my ideal situation would have a center in the district where students would receive basic instruction in English until able to survive in regular classes. Time in center would be reduced as proficiency in English language and acclimation to culture improved. Goal is transition, not maintenance.
2. Continue assigning teacher or reading specialist in each school to help student regularly.
3. Develop resource bank of people able to speak various languages and willing to interpret linguistic and cultural expressions.
4. Nothing in this situation should imply any lack of respect for or concern with maintaining student's native language. Priority for survival in this community, however, must be on developing proficiency in English language and on coping with American cultural peculiarities.

H. I would have older pupils in a self-contained situation by the age groups shown on the front of this survey. They would meet all day with an ESL team including teacher, aide, reading specialist. Pupils would be placed in regular Math classes according to their ability in that area. Pupils would go to other areas for Art, Music, Physical Education, Industrial Arts, etc. With a concentrated effort in the self-contained situation, the pupils would soon be able to be mainstreamed into regular classes of Science, Math and Foreign Language, but continue with ESL team for English Language, Reading and Social Studies to take care of special needs they have in those areas. In the past most of our pupils adjusted quickly (9-12 weeks) to the Math-Science areas and within a year they were able to participate fully in a mainstream situation.

H. cont'd

The younger pupils do not face the urgency of entering the adult world of job-seeking and preparing for advanced education, so their need for a concentrated effort is less than for the junior high and senior high pupils. We have been quite successful with a program of tutors in English along with Title I Reading and regular reading teachers. The younger pupils seem to be more comfortable in classrooms with the regular teacher and pupils of their own age.

I. LEP students need to be immersed in a total language experience that provides them with many opportunities to learn to do with English what is done with it by those who speak it and write it natively. This can be done when teachers, administrators and guidance counselors demonstrate varying degrees of patience, understanding and perseverance, when they can suspend for a six-month period the "belief" that students learn from patterned drills alone, when they can allow students the time necessary for them to obtain the generalizations that underlie the language in an atmosphere of warmth, understanding and support. This needs to be done without demonstrations of guilt, anxiety about standardized test results, or feelings that LEP students are learning nothing because no one is communicating with them in their own language.

J. Since we have such a diversity of cultures and languages the ideal situation would be the creation of an ESL resource room where materials could be centralized. Students could be scheduled according to language proficiency and age. The resource room could service the entire school district with the necessary materials to help students make the transition from their native language to English and to help teachers plan learning centers and activities for the LEP children in their classes, as well as preparing cultural and/or language packets dealing with the LEP's native language. There is a great need to help the regular classroom teacher in dealing with LEP students. LEP students might also be used as a resource in the gifted program - (teaching a foreign language to a gifted student who could in turn teach English). When students are paired up with peer, they usually learn very well together. Ideally also, LEP students could receive some instruction in their native language as a supplement or as a "gifted" activity. This really would be ideal.

K. On the basis of observations, I feel that a total immersion ESL program, varying in duration from one to two years, should be a must for all students. A bilingual component should definitely be included at Pre-K and Kindergarten levels. Secondary students should be given survival skills in the new culture as well as some vocational training and guidance (possibly including some bilingual component). A bilingual ESL special education class would be very beneficial at both elementary and secondary levels. (A bilingual psychologist using instruments free of cultural bias is absolutely essential.) Bilingual counselors well versed in the needs of students adjusting to a new culture and the frustration involved with their adjustments are necessary. Last, but also very important, is an ongoing commitment by all bilingual/ESL staff to in-service school district personnel in the culture of LEP students as well as special techniques in dealing with LEP students' maintenance into their classrooms.

K. cont'd

A Diagnostic Center for testing and placing LEP pupils is also needed:

1. Locate in an elementary school.
2. Send all LEP pupils new to district to determine:

   a. Language Dominance
   b. General ability
   c. Reading level
   d. Psychological problems
   e. Learning problems

3. Resource Room for LD, EMR, etc., for LEP pupils.

   a. (ESOL for Spanish and Arabic pupils) located in an elementary school

4. ESOL help for LEP pupils in kindergarten.

L. Two transitional classes should be instituted for non-English speaking students. A Level I class for new enrollees and a Level II class for students who have oral communication skills but who cannot read or write in English. In addition to these classes, an ESL teacher should be retained to coordinate, tutor and teach English to these students.

LEP children can fall into two categories, each with their own special needs. They are the totally new non-English speakers and the transitional students, those who can speak English but who are performing below level in all academic areas. The two groups should have qualified ESL teachers to teach them.

The totally non-English speakers up to a level 3 should be placed in an intensive center for ESL where they would receive instruction within a Bilingual-ESL Transitional Curriculum. I say bilingual since we must serve the two highest enrollments of LEP students who speak either Spanish or Arabic as their first language. We could accommodate this need by centralizing our ESL teachers in one Intensive Language Center where all students would be sent for all diagnostic pretesting and full self-contained Bilingual-ESL instruction. The classes would be nongraded, but rather according to Language Proficiency Levels.

In order to serve the LEP transitional students, we would place them in the same setting. However, there would be other regular graded Monolingual English-Speaking classes in the building where the LEP students would be mainstreamed for academic areas in which they could achieve. There is a definite need to serve these children, whose conversational English is fluent and perhaps error-free, but who are experiencing difficulty with cognitive tasks, reading comprehension and writing as they reach upper elementary school. At the present time some of these children are being placed in an EMR setting which is the only existing program to most adequately serve them.

M. I would suggest a program based on the principles of Open Education. This would involve the following:

1. Minimum of lessons for whole class - Emphasis on small groups or individuals.
2. Variety of activities going on simultaneously.
3. Flexible scheduling so that children can engage in various activities for varying lengths of time.
4. Environment rich in materials both commercial and homemade.
5. Freedom for children to move around, to talk, to work together, to ask someone for help.
6. Opportunities provided for children to make decisions about their work and to develop responsibility for the achievement of those objectives.
7. Integration of curriculum,ex. Language Arts with Science, math, social studies.
8. Flexible learning groups centered around children's interests in addition to the academic ones and geared towards the children's needs.
9. Allowing for particular "learning styles" of children in a bicultural environment.
10. Affective and individualized approaches geared towards development of self-concept, self-esteem, confidence, trust and acceptance as well as respect for diversity.

Students: Must work at their own speed, on their own level.

11. Minimum of grading and marking. Students should be evaluated on the basis of where they were when you got them (basic-Diagnostic test). They should progress on an individual basis.
12. Accurate, current diagnostic and evaluative instruments are a must. Facilities: space, equipment, commercial materials.

In addition, I would like to add that team-teaching might be a valuable component in a program for LEP students. In this way, there would be more input and more feedback in the teaching of these students. I feel the quality is improved in team-teaching because of a system of "checks and balances." Also the psyches of LEP students are to be treated with special consideration as they face an alien environment. The students might experience different kinds of success with a variety of teachers focusing on them. I hesitate to suggest that a single individual be responsible for the introduction of these students to English and to the school environment.

N. When an ESL student is enrolled, the program should consist of:

1. obtaining information on the new student by the principal, guidance counselor, or secretary.

2. providing the appropriate resources.

3. a conference with the parent(s) or guardian to determine special needs of the student.

4. obtaining school records for previous educational background.

5. testing. The school psychologist would administer a battery of tests.

6. planning a special program.

Program planning should provide for:

...maximum involvement with English-speaking people
...emphasis on language development for communication
...limited subject matter
...individual tutoring
...constant evaluation

7. a program with instruction in ESL and the content areas. The initial ESL program may require more than 50% of the day. This can then be reduced to as much as 15%. The time is spent in language development and usage, listening, reading and basic mathematics.

8. supportive activities. These would include:

   ...communicating with other students and teachers as to cultural differences of the ESL student.
   ...periodic counseling with some English dominant peers to assist in the ESL student's adjustment.
   ...an interpreter for home-school communications.
   ...encouraging the ESL student to participate in the school cocurricular activity program. Peers can be contacted and encouraged to invite the ESL student to school activities.
   ...sending materials home for reinforcement activities.
   ...providing in-service activities for the instructional and supportive team.

9. periodic evaluation to determine the student's progress and necessary program adjustments. Consequently, a program of graduated mainstreaming with individualized support can be implemented.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary

A needs assessment questionnaire on the needs and programs for limited English proficient (LEP) pupils in Pennsylvania was developed at the request of the second language education advisors in PDE's Bureau of Curriculum Services. It was distributed to all public school districts and to the Roman Catholic nonpublic schools.

The overall response rate of 76 percent was considered sufficient to analyze data and prepare a report which is representative of the entire state. The responding schools report almost 14,000 LEP pupils of whom about two-thirds are Spanish speaking or are from homes where Spanish is spoken.

The large majority of separate schools and districts with any LEP pupils use some type of ESL program, provided either by the local district or the intermediate unit, to assist pupils in increasing their English language proficiency. In fact, only 15 respondents reported having a bilingual program with ESL component. All others reported help in a resource room or by teacher, aide or peer tutors. The cost for these programs above regular instructional costs $382 per pupil per year in the public school districts, with most of the funds coming from the local budget.

Services to LEP pupils include some opportunities for vocational education, a few (5) bilingual special education classes for the handicapped and an opportunity for gifted LEPs to take part in special classes for the gifted.

The major needs expressed by the districts were for staff, especially ESL teachers, but also bilingual teachers and aides and the full range of bilingual psychologists, counselors, social workers, administrators and clerical staff. State leadership was desired in supplying in-service workshops on methods and cultural understanding for all levels, but especially for primary staff.

Conclusions

Although the response was less than complete (69 public school districts have not responded to date), the number of LEP pupils identified within the state is almost 14,000. The largest single group not included in this survey is the city of Philadelphia whose school district serves about 8,200 LEP pupils in the public schools and another 400 in nonpublic schools. Some of the other nonrespondents serve substantial numbers of LEP pupils, bringing the state total near the 25,000 mark. This suggests that there is indeed a special LEP population to be served, a population which is not going to disappear from our schools.

The size of the LEP constituency suggests that this is an appropriate area for additional PDE assistance. The schools with large proportions of LEP pupils speaking the same non-English language can be served by bilingual staff. Those schools with just a few students scattered throughout the various grade levels and perhaps speaking different languages are faced with a different reality. For them the most practical arrangement may be individual or small group tutoring in the English language and in problem content areas, with the itinerant tutor supplied by the intermediate unit or by a consortium of neighboring districts or schools.

In the comments written by respondents, it is apparent that there is no general philosophical agreement about the most beneficial educational program for LEP pupils. There are advocates of true maintenance bilingual classes, more advocates of transitional bilingual programs and the largest number of respondents advocating various types of ESL methods, with or without any native language maintenance. Since a survey of available literature on the subject gives a similar variety of results, with success stories for all methods, there is no basis for PDE leadership to select a firm position and advocate one particular method in all Pennsylvania schools. It may indeed be true that the most beneficial method depends on individual cases and all the surrounding circumstances.

The one certain thing that is apparent from this needs survey is that schools have needs for LEP pupil education and that these needs must be met by local, IU or PDE action. The method advocated by a few respondents of placing non-English speaking pupils into a regular classroom of appropriate grade level and letting them do the best they can to pick up the language and the academic learning is not adequate. Too many have failed in this type of situation. The purpose of schools is to promote success, not failure; so LEP pupils in Pennsylvania must be provided with the necessary tools and services to make success a possibility. Our society needs productive successful citizens, not school dropouts who never learned how to communicate in English. PDE must lead in providing schools with the understanding and techniques needed to help LEP pupils obtain the English language and other content area knowledge and skills necessary for a successful life in this country.

APPENDIX

Needs Questionnaire
Bilingual/ESL Pupils

School District Name:

Directions: This is a statewide survey to ascertain the number of students with limited English proficiency (LEP) in the schools, their needs, the schools' current programs for meeting the needs and the needs of the schools for improving the services. For items on which exact information is not available, please give your best estimate (e.g., for how many pupils is Spanish the "home language?"). Where boxes are provided for numbers of pupils, please right justify the numbers.

1. Give the number of pupils whose first language is other than English or who come from homes where a language other than English is commonly spoken.

Grades	K-3	4-6	7-9	10-12	Total

2. Categorize these children by their home language. (Please give numbers of pupils.)

010 Arabic	130 Korean		(List Others)
035 Cambodian	146 Laotian		_____
040 Chinese	165 Pa. German		_____
170 Farsi (Iran)	180 Portuguese		_____
075 French	190 Russian		_____
080 German	205 Spanish		_____
085 Greek	220 Tagalog		_____
100 Hindi	230 Thai (Thailand)		
110 Italian	250 Vietnamese		
120 Japanese	300 Unknown		

If your answer to questions 1 and 2 is none, please stop and return form to:

Grace E. Laverty
Bureau of Research and Evaluation
333 Market Street
Harrisburg, PA 17216

DEAS-2249-OT (3/80)

3. The kind and amount of appropriate educational treatment varies according to the needs of the students. Please describe the apparent educational needs of limited English proficient (LEP) pupils in your district, giving numbers of pupils involved.

A. [ ][ ][ ] Do not speak or understand English.

B. [ ][ ][ ] Entered with little or no educational background in their home language.

C. [ ][ ][ ] Speak English but have difficulty reading and writing in English.

D. [ ][ ][ ] (Other, please explain) _____

_____

E. [ ][ ][ ] (Other)_____

_____

F. [ ][ ][ ] (Other)_____

_____

4. What kinds of programs do the LEP pupils receive in your district? (Please circle the letters of the appropriate answers and complete information where it is requested.)

A. Bilingual including ESL component.

B. ESL only. [ ] Daya per week. [ ] Hours per day.

C. ESL tutoring. [ ][ ] Hours per week.

D. Regular classes with bilingual aide.

E. Resource room. [ ][ ] Hours per week.

F. Resource teacher (other than regular staff). [ ][ ] Hours per week.

G. Peer tutoring. [ ][ ] Hours per week.

H. Itinerant IU teacher. [ ][ ] Hours per week.

I. Other (explain)_____

_____

_____

5. How are you addressing the bicultural component of the curriculum?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

6. Please list below the numbers of major subject teachers involved in bilingual and/or ESL programs according to their language proficiency and areas in which they are certificated.

A. BILINGUAL PROGRAM TEACHERS

Native Language	Other Language	Certification Areas	Number of Teachers

Total Bilingual Teachers ☐☐☐

B. ESL PROGRAM TEACHERS

NonEnglish language(s)		

Total ESL Teachers ☐☐☐

C. Instructional Aides: (Number) ☐☐☐

7. What is the additional cost of special programs for your LEP pupils over and above the regular per pupil instructional cost in your district? (While dollars only)

$ ☐☐☐ per LEP student (in addition to regular)

8. How is the bilingual/ESL program funded?

A. Local funds completely
B. ESEA Title VII funding
C. ESEA Title I
D. Indo-Chinese Refugee Children Assistance Act
E. Migrant Education
F. Other (specify)_____
G. Other_____
H. Other_____

9. How are pupils evaluated for original placement in the bilingual or ESL program? For entry into regular program? Please include names of tests used.

Placement: _____

_____

_____

_____

Entry into regular program? _____

_____

_____

_____

10. How do you evaluate the achievement of students in bilingual or ESL programs? (Please circle the letter of your response and complete other requested information.)

A. They take standardized achievement tests in English.

B. They take teacher-made tests in English.

C. They take standardized achievement tests in their native language. (Please attach list of tests used.)

D. They take teacher-made tests in their native language.

E. Because of language problems they are not tested at all.

F. Other _____

_____

_____

11. Does your vocational education program contain a bilingual/ESL component?

Yes____ No____

12. How many of your LEP students in grades 10 to 12 are enrolled in a vocational education program? ☐☐☐

13. How many of the LEP students in grades 10 to 12 are enrolled in the vocational-technical school? ☐☐☐

14. To what extent do you believe your program is adversely affected by: (Please circle one number for each item)

	Not at all	Some	A lot
A. Pupil mobility	1	2	3
B. Attendance irregularity	1	2	3
C. Lack of materials in child's language	1	2	3
D. Lack of personnel proficient in child's language	1	2	3
E. Too great an age difference in a class	1	2	3

15. What do you see as your school district's major needs in educating LEP pupils? (Please circle letter of major need area (A, B, C or D) and complete detail for that number)

A. Staff (circle number of needed personnel)

1. Elementary bilingual teachers
2. Secondary bilingual teachers -- what content areas?

_____ _____ _____

3. ESL teachers
4. Bilingual aides
5. Bilingual psychologist
6. Bilingual counselors
7. Bilingual clerical staff
8. Bilingual administrators
9. Bilingual social worker
10. Other (specify)_____

B. Materials. What kind?_____

_____

_____

C. In-service opportunities.

What kind? For whom?

_____

_____

_____

D. Other (specify)

_____

_____

_____

16. Where should the state focus its leadership efforts in relation to educating LEP Students? (Please circle one in each column.)

A. Preschool
B. Primary
C. Middle school
D. High school

1. In-service workshops on methods
2. Technical assistance on proposal guidelines
3. More efforts to encourage teacher education programs
4. In-service on understanding of diverse cultures
5. Publications. Topics? _____

_____

6. Other (specify)_____

_____

17. A. How many of your LEP students need special education (classes for the various categories of physically, mentally and emotionally handicapped)? ☐☐☐

B. What tests are used to diagnose such handicaps?

_____

_____

C. How many of the psychologists who tested the students speak the native language of the child? ☐☐☐

D. Do you have a bilingual special education class? Yes___ No___

18. A. Are your LEP students tested for entrance into the gifted program?

Yes___ No___

B. How many LEP students are enrolled in special classes for the gifted?

☐☐☐

YOUR COMMENT: If you could have the ideal situation, what method do you think would be best for educating LEP pupils? What staff and facilities would you want? (For more space, use back of sheet.)

Please return completed form by April 4, 1980

To: Grace E. Laverty
Bureau of Research and Evaluation
333 Market Street
Harrisburg, PA 17126